(76)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
Writ Petition (C) No. 3637 of 2007

Petitioner		Anup Rateria, aged about 45 years, son of Late Shyam Kishore Rateria, occupation-Business, Ward No. 21, Raigarh, resident of Near Gourishankar Mandir, Raigarh, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)
		Versus
Respondents	1	The State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Home Affairs, Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
	2	The Director General of Police, Police Head Quarter – Raipur (C.G.)
	3.	Inspector General of Police, Division-Bilaspur, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.)
	4.	Superintendent of Police, District Raigarh (C.G.)
	5.	Station House Officer/Town Inspector, City Kotwali, Raigarh, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)
	6.	Commissioner, Directorate of Urban Administration and Development, Raipur (C.G.)
	7.	Inspector General, Economic Office Wing, State of Chhattisgarh, Raipur (C.G.)
	8.	Mayor, Municipal Corporation-Raigarh (C.G.)
	9.	Commissioner, Municipal Corporation-Raigarh (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri**

Shri Vipin Punjabi, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri A.S. Kachhawaha, Govt. Advocate for the respondents/State.

ORDER
(Passed on this 28th day of June, 2007)

1. By this petition, the petitioner seeks a direction to the respondents No. 1 to 7 to register the offence/crime and investigate the matter against the respondents No. 8 and 9.

2. According to learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the petitioner has lodged a report on 25.4.2007 before the Director General of Police, Inspector General of Police, Police

Superintendent and City Inspector of Police, highlighting some serious allegations against the respondents No. 8 and 9. The Deputy Inspector General of Police has written to the Inspector General of Police, Economic Crime Investigation Bureau, Raipur vide letter dated 16.5.2007 (Annexure P/4) and the Superintendent of Police, Anti Corruption Bureau, C.G., Raipur vide letter dated 21.5.2007 (Annexure P/5) has also written to the Commissioner, Urban Administration and Development, Raipur for taking action with regard to the complaint made by the petitioner.

3. On perusal of the documents, it is evident that the investigating agencies are already on job and at this stage, there is no sembiance of any right or breach thereof, to call for indulgence of this Court in exercise of its discretionary power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

4. The petition is pre-mature and as such, no cause of action has arisen at this stage. Thus, the writ petition is dismissed, summarily.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

B/-